



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/820,695	04/09/2004	Kaoru Masuda	KOBE.0061	, 8731

7590 11/28/2006

REED SMITH HAZEL & THOMAS
Suite 1400
3110 Fairview Park Drive
Falls Church, VA 22042

EXAMINER

DELCOTTO, GREGORY R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1751

DATE MAILED: 11/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/820,695

Applicant(s)

MASUDA ET AL.

Examiner

Gregory R. Del Cotto

Art Unit

1751

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 September 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5,7-10,13,14,16 and 18-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5,7-10,13,14,16 and 18-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 5, 7-10, 13, 14, 16, and 18-23 are pending. Claims 2-4, 6, 11, 12, 15, and 17 have been canceled. Note that, Applicant's amendments and arguments filed 9/5/06 have been entered.

Priority

Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d). The certified copy has been filed in parent Application No. 10/240,848 filed on 10/4/02.

Objections/Rejections Withdrawn

The following objections/rejections as set forth in the Office action mailed 5/3/06 have been withdrawn:

None.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1, 5, 7-10, 13, 14, 16, and 18-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

With respect to instant claims 1, 5, 19, 20, and 23, these claims are vague and indefinite in that they read "...so as to maintain the composition...." But do not recite what form or state the composition is maintained in; the language is confusing and awkward. For instance, is the composition maintained in a homogeneous state, a

Art Unit: 1751

heterogeneous state, a dispersion, etc. Clarification is required. For purposes of examination and consistent with the instant specification, the Examiner has interpreted the claims as a single composition containing all the components.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 5, 7, 8, 13, 14, 16, 18-20, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mullee (US 6,306,564) in view of Vaartstra (US 6,242,165) and Skee et al (US 5,989,353).

Mullee teaches a commercially available solvent, such as a stripping chemical and/or an organic solvent, is supported by supercritical CO₂ to remove a resist, its residue, and/or an organic contaminant off the surface of a semiconductor wafer. See Abstract. Preferred types of chemicals include N-methyl pyrrolidone, diglycol amine, hydroxyl amine, catechol, tertiary amines, ammonium fluoride, ammonium bifluoride, etc. Other chemicals such as an organic solvent may be used independently or added to one or more of the chemicals to remove organic contaminants from the wafer surface. These solvents include an alcohol, dimethyl sulfoxide, methanol, ethanol, etc. See column 4, lines 10-30.

Mullee does not teach an alkyl ammonium fluoride, a quaternary ammonium hydroxide, or a cleaning composition containing carbon dioxide, a alkyl ammonium fluoride compound, a quaternary ammonium hydroxide, a cosolvent, and the other requisite components in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims.

Vaartstra teaches a method for removing organic material in the fabrication of structures including providing a substrate assembly having an exposed organic material and removing at least a portion of the exposed organic material using a composition having at least one component in a supercritical state. See Abstract. Additionally, other components may be added to the compositions to enhance the organic material removal process. Buffering agents such as ammonium fluoride, tetramethyl ammonium fluoride, surfactants, etc., may be added to the compositions. See column 6, lines 10-25.

Skee et al teach microelectronics substrates which are cleaned to remove metal contamination while maintaining wafer substrate surface smoothness by contacting the wafer substrate surfaces with an aqueous cleaning solution of an alkaline, metal ion-free base and a polyhydroxy compound. See Abstract. Suitable alkaline components include tetramethylalkyl ammonium hydroxide, tetraethyl ammonium hydroxide, 2-methyl-1, 5-pentanediamine, monoethanolamine, etc. See column 5, lines 1-25.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to use tetramethyl ammonium fluoride in the cleaning composition taught by Mullee, with a reasonable expectation of success, because Vaartstra teaches the equivalence of tetramethyl ammonium fluoride to ammonium fluoride in a similar cleaning composition and further, Mullee teaches the use of ammonium fluoride.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to use tetramethylammonium hydroxide in the composition taught by Mullee, with a reasonable expectation of success, because Skee et al teach the equivalence of quaternary ammonium hydroxide to various amines as an alkaline compound in a similar cleaning composition and further, Mullee teaches the use of alkaline compounds including various amines.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to formulate a cleaning composition containing carbon dioxide, a fluoride compound, a quaternary ammonium hydroxide, a cosolvent, and the other requisite components in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims, with a reasonable expectation of success and similar results with respect to other disclosed

Art Unit: 1751

components, because the broad teachings of Mullee in combination with Vaartstra and Skee et al suggest a cleaning composition containing carbon dioxide, a fluoride compound, a quaternary ammonium hydroxide, a cosolvent, and the other requisite components in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims.

Claims 1, 5, 7-10, 16, 18-20, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 01/33613 in view of Vaartstra (US 6,242,165) and Skee et al (US 5,989,353).

Note that, while a translation of the priority document has been submitted, the Examiner asserts that the document does not provide priority for an ammonium fluoride having the formula as recited by instant claims 1, 5, 20 and 23 wherein the R groups may be any alkyl group or for "a compound having a hydroxyl group" as recited by instant claim 5. The priority document does provide support for specific ammonium fluorides as recited by instant claim 13. Thus, '613 is still applicable over the rejected claims as set forth above.

'613 teaches a method of removing photoresist and residue from a substrate by maintaining supercritical carbon dioxide, an amine, and a solvent in contact with the substrate so that the amine and the solvent at least partially dissolve the photoresist and the residue. See Abstract. Preferable amines include (2-(methylamino)ethanol, PMDETA, triethanolamine, etc. Preferably, the solvent is selected from DMSO, ethylene carbonate, N-methylpyrrolidone, BLO, acetic acid, etc. See page 5, lines 5-30. One embodiment of the invention includes a composition containing an aqueous

fluoride such as ammonium fluoride, an amine, and solvent for cleaning photoresists.

See page 10, lines 25-35.

'613 does not teach an alkyl ammonium fluoride, a quaternary ammonium hydroxide, or a cleaning composition containing carbon dioxide, a alkyl ammonium fluoride compound, a quaternary ammonium hydroxide, a cosolvent, and the other requisite components in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims.

Vaarstra and Skee et al are relied upon as set forth above.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to use tetramethyl ammonium fluoride in the cleaning composition taught by '613, with a reasonable expectation of success, because Vaartstra teaches the equivalence of tetramethyl ammonium fluoride to ammonium fluoride in a similar cleaning composition and further, '613 teaches the use of ammonium fluoride.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to use tetramethylammonium hydroxide in the composition taught by '613, with a reasonable expectation of success, because Skee et al teach the equivalence of quaternary ammonium hydroxide to various amines as an alkaline compound in a similar cleaning composition and further, '613 teaches the use of alkaline compounds including various amines.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to formulate a cleaning composition containing carbon dioxide, a fluoride compound, a quaternary ammonium hydroxide, a cosolvent, and the other requisite components in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims, with a

reasonable expectation of success and similar results with respect to other disclosed components, because the broad teachings of '613 in combination with Vaartstra and Skee et al suggest a cleaning composition containing carbon dioxide, a fluoride compound, a quaternary ammonium compound, a cosolvent, and the other requisite components in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims.

Claims 1, 5, 7-10, 13, 14, 16, 18-20, and 23 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Xu et al (US 2003/0125225) in view of Skee et al (US 5,989,353).

Note that, while a translation of the priority document has been submitted, the Examiner asserts that the document does not provide priority for an ammonium fluoride having the formula as recited by instant claims 1, 5, 20 and 23 wherein the R groups may be any alkyl group or for "a compound having a hydroxyl group" as recited by instant claim 5. The priority document does provide support for specific ammonium fluorides as recited by instant claim 13. Thus, Xu et al is still applicable over the rejected claims as set forth above.

Xu et al teach chemical formulations and methods for removing unwanted material, such as unexposed photoresist, metal oxides, CMP residue, and the like, from semiconductor wafers or other substrates. The formulations utilize a supercritical fluid-based cleaning composition, which may further include co-solvent(s), surfactant(s), chelating agent(s), and/or chemical reactant(s). See Abstract. Suitable supercritical fluids include carbon dioxide, oxygen, argon, water, ammonia, etc. Suitable co-solvents include methanol, ethanol, N-methylpyrrolidone, monoethanolamine, alkyl ammonium

Art Unit: 1751

fluoride, butylene carbonate, etc. See para. 10-12. One preferred embodiment relates to a cleaning composition comprising supercritical carbon dioxide, isopropanol, and ammonium fluoride. See para. 29. Another embodiment includes a composition containing a supercritical fluid, cosolvent, active agent, surfactant, and chelating agent. See para. 38. Suitable active agents include ammonium fluoride, alkyl sulfonic acids, alkyl amines, etc. See para. 43. Surfactants useful may be of any type and include anionic, nonionic, cationic, and zwitterionic types. See para. 46.

Specifically, Xu et al teach a cleaning composition containing supercritical CO₂, isopropanol, and ammonium fluoride. See paras. 89-91.

Xu et al do not teach the use of a quaternary ammonium hydroxide or a cleaning composition containing carbon dioxide, a alkyl ammonium fluoride compound, a quaternary ammonium hydroxide, a cosolvent, and the other requisite components in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims.

Skee et al are relied upon as set forth above.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to use tetramethylammonium hydroxide in the composition taught by Xu et al, with a reasonable expectation of success, because Skee et al teach the equivalence of quaternary ammonium hydroxide to various amines as an alkaline compound in a similar cleaning composition and further, Xu et al teach the use of alkaline compounds including various amines.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to formulate a cleaning composition containing carbon dioxide, a

Art Unit: 1751

fluoride compound, a quaternary ammonium hydroxide, a cosolvent, and the other requisite components in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims, with a reasonable expectation of success and similar results with respect to other disclosed components, because the broad teachings of Xu et al in combination with Skee et al suggest a cleaning composition containing carbon dioxide, a fluoride compound, a quaternary ammonium compound, a cosolvent, and the other requisite components in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims.

Claims 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mullee (US 6,306,564) in view of Vaarstra and Skee et al (US 5,989,353), WO 01/33613 in view of Vaarstra and Skee et al (US 5,989,353), or Xu et al (US 2003/0125225) in view of Skee et al (US 5,989,353) as applied to the rejected claims above, and further in view of McCullough et al (US 5,976,264).

Mullee, '613, Vaarstra, Xu et al, and Skee et al are relied upon as set forth above. However, none of the references teach the use of methane or a fluorosurfactant in addition to the other requisite components of the composition as recited by instant claims 21 and 22.

McCullough et al teach a method for the removal of fluorine or chlorine residue from an etched precision surface such as a semiconductor sample which comprises exposing said precision surface to liquid CO₂ under appropriate conditions that are sufficient to remove the residue from the precision surface. See Abstract. The preferred supercritical fluid is carbon dioxide which may be used alone or in admixture with another additive such as H₂O, Ar, NH₃, methane, etc. Surfactants which aid in

Art Unit: 1751

removing the reactive ion etching residue from the semiconductor sample containing at least one CF_x functional group may also be used in conjunction with a supercritical fluid. See column 5, lines 5-30.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to use methane in the cleaning composition taught by Mullee, '613, or Xu et al, with a reasonable expectation of success, because McCullough et al teach the equivalence of methane to carbon dioxide as a supercritical fluid in a similar cleaning composition and further, Mullee, '613, and Xu et al teach the use of carbon dioxide as a supercritical fluid.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to use a surfactant containing at least one CF_x functional group in the composition taught by Mullee, '613, or Xu et al, with a reasonable expectation of success, because McCullough et al teach the use of a surfactant containing at least one CF_x functional group aid in semiconductor residue removal in a similar composition which would be desirable in the compositions taught by Mullee, '613, or Xu et al.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mullee (US 6,306,564) in view of Vaarstra as applied to claims 1, 5, 7, 8, 13, 14, 16, 18-20, and 23 above, and further in view of McCullough et al (US 5,976,264) or WO01/33613.

Mullee and Vaarstra are relied upon as set forth above. However, Mullee do not teach the use of water in addition to the other requisite components of the composition as recited by the instant claims.

McCullough et al or '613 are relied upon as set forth above.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to use water in the cleaning composition taught by Mullee, with a reasonable expectation of success, because McCullough et al teach the equivalence of H₂O to carbon dioxide as a supercritical fluid in a similar cleaning composition and, further, Mullee teaches the use of supercritical CO₂.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to use water in the cleaning composition taught by Mullee, with a reasonable expectation of success, because '613 teaches the use of aqueous solutions of ammonium fluoride in a similar cleaning composition and, further, Mullee teaches the use of ammonium fluoride in general which usually is formulated as an aqueous solution.

Response to Arguments

With respect to Mullee, '613, or Xu et al, Applicant states that none of these references teach or suggest a composition of elements that are combined together so as to be applied to the microstructure intended to be cleaned as a single composition as recited by the instant claims. In response, note that, the Examiner maintains that each of these references in combination with secondary references teach a single composition containing the requisite components of the composition in the specific amounts as recited by the instant claims. Note that, Mullee teaches that the supercritical carbon dioxide may contain a small amount of one or more chemicals which indicates that the supercritical carbon dioxide plus the additional components may be used as a single composition (See column 4, lines 1-40). '613 teaches that the

Art Unit: 1751

composition used to remove photoresist residues contains supercritical carbon dioxide, an amine, a solvent and aqueous fluoride which is a single composition as recited by the instant claims (See page 10, lines 25-35). Further, Xu et al teach formulations which utilize a supercritical fluid-based cleaning composition which may further include a co-solvent, surfactant, chelating agent, and chemical reactant. See Abstract. Suitable supercritical fluids include carbon dioxide. See paras. 32-33. Xu et al teach single compositions which may be used to clean photoresist substrates. Thus, the Examiner maintains that the broad teachings of Mullee, '613, or Xu et al suggest single compositions containing supercritical carbon dioxide along with other components which may be used to clean substrates which are the same as the single compositions recited by the instant claims.

With respect to Vaarstra and Skee et al, Applicant states that neither of these secondary references provide any disclosure, teaching or suggestion that makes up for the deficiencies in Mullee, '613, or Xu et al such that their combination could embody each and every feature of the present invention as claimed. Applicants further point out that Vaarstra does not involve any process of composition that includes the use of a solvent which Skee does not involve the use of any supercritical components. Additionally, Applicant states that the Examiner has improperly used hindsight reasoning to establish a prima facie case of obviousness. In response, note that, Vaarstra and Skee et al are secondary references relied upon for their teaching of tetramethyl ammonium fluoride and tetramethylammonium hydroxide, respectively. The Examiner maintains that one of ordinary skill in the art would clearly have been

Art Unit: 1751

motivated to use tetramethyl ammonium fluoride in the composition taught by Mullee or '613, with a reasonable expectation of success, because Vaartstra teaches the equivalence of tetramethyl ammonium fluoride to ammonium fluoride in a similar cleaning composition and further, Mullee or '613 teach the use of ammonium fluoride. Furthermore, the Examiner maintains that one of ordinary skill in the art would clearly have been motivated to use tetramethylammonium hydroxide in the composition taught by Mullee, '613, or Xu et al, with a reasonable expectation of success, because Skee et al teach the equivalence of quaternary ammonium hydroxide to various amines as an alkaline compound in a similar cleaning composition and further, Mullee, '613, or Xu et al teach the use of alkaline compounds including various amines.

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971). Thus, the Examiner maintains that the combination of references set forth above is sufficient to suggest the claimed composition and establish a prima facie case of obviousness.

Conclusion


THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory R. Del Cotto whose telephone number is (571) 272-1312. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. thru Fri. from 8:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Douglas McGinty can be reached on (571) 272-1029. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Gregory R. Del Cotto
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1751

GRD
November 20, 2006